George Livermore

New Plottings to Aid the Rebellion.

MR. JAY'S SECOND LETTER

ON

DAWSON'S INTRODUCTION TO THE FEDERALIST.

EXPOSING ITS FALSIFICATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION; ITS LIBELS ON DUANE, LIVINGSTON, JAY AND HAMILTON; AND ITS CONNECTION WITH SIMILAR EFFORTS BY TRAITORS AT HOME, AND FOES ABROAD, TO MAINTAIN THE REBEL DOCTRINE OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY FOR THE SUBVERSION OF THE UNITY OF THE REPUBLIC, AND THE SUPREME SOVEREIGNTY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

"The bantling—I had liked to have said,—MONSTER."
Washington on State Sovereignty.

NEW YORK:
JAMES G. GREGORY, 46 WALKER STREET.

LONDON:
SAMPSON LOW, SON & MARSTON, 14 LUDGATE HILL.

1864.

George Livermore, Esq.
With the compliments of
Chas. J. Moore

New Plottings to Aid the Rebellion.

MR. JAY'S SECOND LETTER

ON

DAWSON'S INTRODUCTION TO THE FEDERALIST.

EXPOSING ITS FALSIFICATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION; ITS LIBELS ON DUANE, LIVINGSTON, JAY AND HAMILTON; AND ITS CONNECTION WITH SIMILAR EFFORTS BY TRAITORS AT HOME, AND FOES ABROAD, TO MAINTAIN THE REBEL DOCTRINE OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY FOR THE SUBVERSION OF THE UNITY OF THE REPUBLIC, AND THE SUPREME SOVEREIGNTY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

"The bantling—I had liked to have said,—MONSTER."
Washington on State Sovereignty.

NEW YORK:
JAMES G. GREGORY, 46 WALKER STREET.

LONDON:
SAMPSON LOW, SON & MARSTON, 14 LUDGATE HILL.
1864.

WASHINGTON TO MADISON, 1787:

" * * Thirteen Sovereignties pulling against each other and all tugging at the Federal head, will soon bring ruin on the whole."

FRANKLIN PIERCE TO JEFFERSON DAVIS, *Jan.* 6, 1860:

" * * The fighting will not be along Mason and Dixon's line merely. It will be within our borders—in our own streets," &c.

VALLANDIGHAM TO COL. D. D. INSHALL, *of the 8th Alabama Volunteers*, 1863:

" * * You have but to persevere, and the victory will easily be yours. You must strike home. * * You can have your own terms by giving battle on your enemies' soil."

MR. JAY'S SECOND LETTER

ON

DAWSON'S INTRODUCTON

TO THE

THE FEDERALIST.

To the Editors of the Evening Post.

Sirs,—When in February I wrote my first letter on Mr. Daw son's edition of the *Federalist*, I had been chiefly struck with the instances to which I called attention, of the singular misappreciation exhibited, in the "Introduction," of the character of the work, its extraordinary misrepresentation of the course pursued by the friends of the Constitution, and its inexplicable violation of historic truth in regard to the most familiar incidents in the life of my grandfather.

In the face of the fact apparent to every student of American history, and which is thus stated by John Adams, "Mr. Jay had as much influence in the preparatory measures for digesting the Constitution and in obtaining its adoption as any man in the nation," a fact which has been eloquently dwelt upon by Mr. Webster in his well known letter to the Honorable James A. Hamilton and other citizens of Westchester county, the declaration of Mr. Dawson that Jay found in the Constitution "little that he could commend, and nothing for which he could labor," seemed to me to exhibit a very remarkable amount either of ignorance or of malice.

A more careful reading of the "Introduction," the tone of Mr.

Dawson's reply, and facts that have since come to my knowledge of his association with certain writers in the interest of the Rebellion, convince me that it would be unjust to attribute Mr. Dawson's errors purely to ignorance, or his assaults upon Jay simply to personal malice; and I propose to show that his "Introduction" is but part of a wide-spread attempt to mystify and demoralize the American people in regard to the American Constitution: to convince them, if possible, that they do not constitute a nation: and to persuade them that their only safety consists in dissolving the Union, and recognizing the individual sovereignty of each separate State.

The questions involved in this examination, relate to the constitutional history of the country, and, in their bearing upon the issues of the pending war, concern the gravest interests of the American people. In noticing, therefore, some parts of Mr. Dawson's reply, I shall omit all reference to the personalities which he has introduced, seemingly with no other intent than to divert attention from the real issue. If he has misrepresented the facts of history, as I shall prove that he has done, he cannot justify those misrepresentations by perverting the facts of the last decade: nor can he, by slanders upon the living, atone for libels on the dead.

MR. DAWSON'S PLEDGES IN ASKING ASSISTANCE.

Before proceeding to expose the character and aim of Mr. Dawson's introduction, it may be proper for me to explain how I was induced to countenance, at his hands, an edition of the *Federalist*. Having known him some ten years since as an active member of an Anti-Slavery League, my intercourse with him had been interrupted by causes to which it is unnecessary to refer, until, on the 17th of February, 1862, he wrote to me that he had undertaken to carry an edition of the *Federalist* through the press, and asked my assistance. He said:

"I desire to make such a work as will satisfy all who may "examine it." And he closed his letter with this assurance:

"In making this request, I beg to assure you that I am actu-"ated entirely by a desire to render justice to the memory of "your ancestor, as one of the authors of the work in question;

" and I trust that for the same reason, and for the purpose of " this enquiry at least, I may be met in the same spirit, regard- " less of past differences on less important subjects."

In a second letter, of March 15, 1862, he remarked:

" As I have said before, I desire to produce an edition of the " *Federalist*, which shall stand the test of the most careful ex- " amination, and my plan of operations has been examined and " heartily approved by Hon. James A. Hamilton,—Mr. John " C., his brother, is too sick to be seen,—and I have received the " use of every paper which he has in his possession. It will " afford me the greatest satisfaction, if I may also enjoy the ben- " efit of your papers, and your advice on the same subject, that " those who follow us may receive from our hands the uncon- " taminated writings of those who have preceded us."

To these requests and assurances, after some hesitation, in view of the urgent occasion for an edition of the *Federalist*, I persuaded myself that I should accede. How Mr. Dawson's pledges have been kept, will appear in the sequel. I promptly wrote to him, as he says, a letter of sixteen pages, with numerous references to the works of Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jay, &c., which I thought might assist him to a thorough appreciation of the contest in regard to the Constitution; and I sent him three extracts from letters of Washington and Jay, bearing upon the same general topic, advising him, however, at the same time, as he admits, that I could find nothing among Jay's papers relative to the *Federalist*.

Having thus—setting aside personal differences—done what I could to assist Mr. Dawson (with whom I had not spoken for years) to make his edition of the *Federalist* as complete as possible, and his acknowledgments of my courtesy and my assistance having been rendered in a manner calculated to induce the belief that I approved of his conduct as an editor, I feel myself absolutely at liberty to subject his part of the work to " the careful examination " which he invited: and to show, not by vague assertion, but by particular facts, that he has not only broken faith with me in his volunteered pledge to do justice to

my ancestor, whom, as I showed in my former letter, he has grossly misrepresented, vilified, and belied; but that he has broken faith with the subscribers to the work, and with the American people, by converting their reverence for the *Federalist* to the purposes of those who would destroy the Constitution, and by making the *Federalist* the vehicle for circulating, in an introduction, distorted criticism on the work, monstrous misrepresentations of the truth of history, and unjust aspersions on the fame of the authors; in short, by offering to loyal citizens, as an honest edition of the *Federalist*, a volume which was intended to aid a plot for overthrowing our Constitution.

NORTHERN CONSPIRACY TO AID THE REBELS.

The *Evening Post* has occasionally directed attention to "Papers from the Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge," organized under the auspices of Mr. S. F. B. Morse, and there is reason to believe that a wide spread conspiracy exists throughout the North, among the sympathizers with the rebellion, for organizing a State's Rights party, for the subversion of the American Constitution, and its reconstruction on the basis, not of National, but of State sovereignty.

It will be remembered that the rebel commissioner from Mississippi to Maryland, in December, 1860, expressly declared that "their plan was for the Southern States to withdraw from the Union for the present, to allow amendments to the Constitution." And it is well known that the rebels have been recommended, by their Northern sympathizers, to continue their resistance, in the hope that the American people might be induced to acquiesce in a project of national suicide. In the Senate of New Jersey, a bill has been recently introduced, to punish, with fine and imprisonment, whoever shall enlist free negroes, thus exhibiting the spirit of State sovereignty,, and the manner in which the doctrine may be made effective to weaken the National Government and add strength to the rebellion. A recent Boston paper calls attention to new movements in Massachusetts, of rebel sympathizers, under the name of "*Citizen* Caucuses," and the use of this term, for the purpose of disloyalty and treason, recalls its employment for similar ob-

jects, during the administration of our first President. It was a favorite designation with that disreputable faction which fomented the rebellion in Pennsylvania, to increase the embarrassments of Washington, and, if possible, to overthrow the Government; which, in defiance alike of patriotism and decency, encouraged Genet, the Minister of the French Republicans, in his efforts to compromise our neutrality, and his threat to appeal from the President to the people, and which exhibited the extent to which party hostility may be carried, by gravely charging Washington, Hamilton, and Jay, with intent to subvert the Constitution and establish a monarchy. Such were the patriots who, in the excess of their zeal for the good of the people, imitated the Jacobins of Paris, and substituted "Citizen" for Mr., and "Citess" for Miss.

The efforts of the faction which is to-day repeating towards the administration of Mr. Lincoln the conduct of its predecessor towards that of Washington, are by no means confined to caucuses.

Among the elaborate works issued by this modern band of conspirators, who call themselves indifferently, "States' Rights Democrats" and "Federal Republican Citizens," is one upon which I chanced in the "Astor Library," entitled, "Citizenship Sovereignty, by J. S. Wright, assisted by Professor J. Holmes Agnew, D. D., Chicago. Published for American Citizens, the true maintainers of State Sovereignty, 1863." The latter of these gentlemen has since been announced as the editor of the *Knickerbocker*, which in an article of the March number, entitled, "The Issue Between the North and the South," denounces the Declaration of Independence as inspired by "a spurious philosophy." As Mr. Wright and Doctor Agnew cordially recognize Mr. Dawson, as an efficient coworker with them in their labors for destroying and reconstructing the Constitution, and quote him as almost wholly concurring in their views, it will be useful to glance at the principles and theories, which, according to them, Mr. Dawson has brought to his editorial exposition of the character of the *Federalist* his elucidation of the history of the Constitution, and the fame and services of its framers and expounders. The work of Messrs. Wright and Agnew—no name of printer or

publisher appears, but the funds are supplied by "a kind patron in New York," and some in Chicago—seems to be intended as a feeler of the public pulse. Its law, according to the advertisement, is approved of by the Honorable Charles O'Conor, and its authors have been constantly assisted by Mr. S. F. B. Morse, to whom they make their acknowledgments for his "judicious counsel and affectionate interest." Its display of learning is well calculated to impress the uninstructed and careless reader, while its parade of impious piety, its daring familiarity with God's designs, its audacious application of Scriptural texts, its affected jealousy of the honour of "our King Jehovah," and its irreverent invocation "for enlightenment by the Holy Ghost," seem intended to divert the attention of the unsuspecting, from the diabolical character of the plot which is gradually unfolded in the volume, for overthowing the constitutional liberties of our Republic and the National Sovereignty of the American people, and subjecting all loyal citizens to the tender mercies of slavery and secession. The reader is treated with references to the Bible, and Barbeyrac, Bacon and Puffendorf, Grotius and Hooker, Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Thomas Ridley, Hobbes and Harrington, Cumberland and Clark, Sherlock and Selden, Tower and Milton, Filmer and Locke, Burlamaqui and Montesquieu, Ferguson and Rutherford, Vattel and Ward, Bentham and Wheaton, Webster and Kent, Martens and Heineccius, Foucher and Lieber, Manning and De Tocqueville, Gillies and Bynkershoeck, Wolfe and Rousseau, Blackstone and Sidney, Manning and Thirlwall, Aristotle, Lord Brougham, Guizot, Lacroit, and Necker. He is cautiously advised of the unfairness of Kent, the misconceptions of Story, the erroneous theories of Hamilton and Jefferson, the ignorance of John Adams of the A B C of the Constitution, the errours of Madison, the confusion of principles exhibited by the views of Marshall, Rawle, Wheaton, Dane, Bradford, Webster, Duer, Lincoln, Everett, Curtis, and Motley, and is taught that on important points, the Governmental teachings of Wheaton, Kent, and Story, have the same tendency with those of Rousseau, Tom Paine, and the French school of Infidelity (page 49). Amid this condemnation of the publicists of America, the teachings of Calhoun are eulogized; the oppor-

tuness is welcomed of "Sectional Controversy," a book by Wm. Chauncey Fowler, LL. D., published by Scribner, New York, advocating the right of secession, and warm praise is bestowed on Professor Hopkins' "valuable work, the *American Citizen*." The reader is next taught that a Sovereign State should be unaccountable to all else but Deity: (p. 48), and that it was ignorance of Governmental principles which led the North, almost to a man to deny the right of secession.

Among the wrongs of the South, is included by the authors- "the infamous deception as to supplying Forts Sumpter and Pickens, * * * to say nothing of previous wrongs, which are greater than even the South has known!" (51.)

The only remedy for secession is represented to be a "re, newal of the league," and "every slave stolen or absconded, and all losses or injuries of every description to be paid for." "The South" (say the authors), "can never with honor consider "the quection of re-union, except on the Federal basis," * * * "and the alternative being war or consolidation, which must "bring monarchy, I hope" (he adds), "with all my heart, "the South will adhere to its course, though the war should "last fifty years" (p. 59).

These States' Rights Democrats, with a marvellous assurance, think this a fitting time to enlarge upon the advantages which the people of the North have derived from the South, giving to the Federal service their "genuine aristocrats," whose superiority to the better classes at the North is warmly insisted upon. (Page 151.)

"If" (say these model democrats!—and it is hard to say whether the sham aristocracy of the Southern slave-masters or the sham democracy of their Northern serfs is the most despicable,) "we cannot have and perpetuate a high grade "of aristocracy from which our rulers shall be almost uniformly "elected, we can never sustain free Government. Revolu- "tions and anarchy must be our fate, till we find relief in Des- "potism, and then fortunate shall we be, if, by establishing an "hereditary Aristocracy, with all its burthens, we shall reach "as free a condition as Britons enjoy." (P. 150.) "Let the "nobility of Britain understand that they have in us, earnest

"coadjutors to maintain Aristocracy" (153); and, as if to show the sincerity of this assurance, we have, on page 159, a sentence almost as startling in its sentiments as in its grammatical construction:

"Had George III. only been as good a Tory as were our "Fathers, (*sic*) the noble fellow, for he was a splendid monarch, "would never have endured the mortification of acknowledging "the independence of these States."

The reader, after duly digesting this new fact in American History, will remember that our Constitution, which Mr. Dawson characterizes as "the devoted instrument," forbids the granting of patents of nobility; there is in this prohibition a real grievance, which loudly demands the reconstruction of the Constitution, to secure to us "as free a condition" as is enjoyed by Britons.

The author proves, to his own satisfaction, that the Confederate States "have nobly sustained themselves," and are better able to-day to continue the contest than when it was begun, and asks: "Should not such a power be recognized by sister nations "as having an existence" (p. 163)? and assures Britain that "thousands of *us* in the North will rejoice" if she will lead Europe in thus maintaining States' Rights. The writer might here, with great propriety, have eulogized the democratic gentlemen of New York who secretly approached Lord Lyons and besought him to secure the intervention of the British Government in our domestic affairs, an act of infamy on the part of American citizens which should never be forgiven nor forgotten.

Mr. Wright expresses displeasure at the timely and able letter of Mr. Motley to the London *Times*, that ally of secession, vindicating our nationality: but declares that "Mr. Henry B. "Dawson has a rod in pickle that will be sufficient to whip him "(Mr. Motley) into the traces." (P. 187.)

The reader is now deemed prepared for the development of the plot; a coming struggle in the North on the question of State Sovereignty is predicted as at hand, and we are told that "the struggle in the days of Adams and Jefferson was nothing "to what this will be." (P. 192.)

A page or two further, and the infernal scheme is hinted at, rather than disclosed, by which these pious States-rights gentlemen hope to accomplish the destruction of our nationality, and the overthrow of the sovereignty of the people:

"Yet will it not be the most impossible of circumstances, if "the Federal Republican citizens of the North should be joined "with the armies of the South, to re-establish the Federal insti- "tutions of our Fathers against the efforts of consolidists and "abolitionists. May God save us from such a horrid catas- "trophe, yet, if it must come, in order to save our institutions, AMEN!"

This Christian resignation to the banding together of Northern renegades and Southern traitors, to desolate the homes of all who cling to the American Constitution and the American Flag, is illustrated by an impious application of the text, as a warning to those who are disposed to resist the traitors, "Woe unto him who striveth with his Maker."

Similar hints begin to abound in the secession newspapers of the North. The Detroit *Free Press* of the 17th March, 1864, in a leader headed "Is a Revolution Imminent?" threatens the Government that unless it yields to their demands "a revolution will come sweeping over the country with the besom of destruction."

The writer again refers to the London *Times*, the demolition of whose arguments in favor of secession he is not disposed to forgive, and says, once more (p. 197): "Mr. Dawson will soon publish a reply to Mr. Motley's letter to the London *Times*." Then comes, on page 197 of Mr. Wright's volume, a passage of great significance in illustrating Mr. Dawson's charges of fraudulent conduct on the part of Hamilton and his associates, in the Introduction to the *Federalist*:

"It has been supposed that prior to the adoption of the present Constitution we were almost in anarchy; to use the words of the elegant Mr. Motley, 'in chaos.' Mr. Dawson will soon publish a reply to Mr. Motley's famous letter to the London *Times*, to which the reader's attention is earnestly bespoken, wherein he demonstrates our immense prosperity at that time,

and beyond doubt it could have been said of us as Moses said of the Hebrews. But Jeshuran waxed fat," &c. Although announced by prospectus nearly two years ago, the world has not yet been favored with this wonderful letter of Mr. Dawson, which has so delighted the hearts of the Chicago secessionists, and which is to demonstrate "our immense prosperity" at the most critical and gloomy period of our history.

I will add but one more extract from Mr. Wright's volume. The opening clause of the Constitution, "We the people," is a clause detested by these "Federal Republican citizens." It unmistakeably recognizes the nationality, the sovereignty of the American people, which the foes of our country at home and abroad are resolved, if possible, to destroy. The significance of those words was not overlooked when the Constitution was adoped. Patrick Henry said, in the Virginia Convention, "Have they said, 'We the States?' Have they made a proposal "of a compact between the States? If they had, this would be "a Confederation. It is otherwise, most clearly, a consolidated "Government. The question turns, sir, on that poor little "thing, the expression, 'We the People,' instead 'of the States "of America.'"

Mr. Wright thinks that the founders of the Constitution should have said, "We the *Peoples*," (a word, I believe, hardly used with us until anglicized by Kossuth,) and he speaks in his book not of the American people, but of "these American Peoples."

At its close, amid Scriptural texts and pious ejaculations that besprinkle the page like a sermon, occurs this objurgation:

"The very first three words, "We the People," of that in-
"strument, drawn without a public invocation of Divine wis-
"dom, with no recognition of the Sovereign of the Universe,
"have been the prime, almost the sole cause of leading these
"peoples astray and into civil war. * * * Accursed be the
"instrument, no matter what loved and honored names are at-
"tached to it, that thus dishonors the Monarch of all Peoples.
"Tear it to shreds, trample it in the dust, damn it to everlast-
"ing infamy," &c. &c. P. 198.

The volume from which these extracts are taken is entitled "Introductory Compend," and it is to be followed by a work to be entitled "Our Federal Union—State Rights and Wrongs," in five volumns, at $2 50 each, and it is announced that Dr. Agnew is to issue, with appropriate notes from the "Republican Stand-Point," translations of Aristotle, Grotius, and Puffendorf.

MR. DAWSON'S CONNECTION WITH THESE CONSPIRATORS, AND THE PART ASSUMED BY HIM.

But the author, and the work, upon which Mr. Wright and Dr. Agnew seem chiefly to rely for important aid in their scheme against the Constitution, which they would tear to shreds, trample in the dust, and damn to eternal infamy, is Mr. Henry B. Dawson, and his edition of the *Federalist*. They evidently look to him as a leader, and quote him as an authority. In the "Explanatory," p. iv., they say:

"Many of the ideas in the compend and also in the work will "be so novel to many readers, that the writer deems it suitable "also to remark that they are *almost wholly concurred in*, both "as to Governmental principles, and as to historic facts, by "Mr. Henry B. Dawson, who being in a similar line of research, "we have frequently had occasion to compare notes. The "chief point of difference between us is, that HE CONSIDERS THE "WORD 'NATION' SHOULD NEVER BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE "UNITED STATES, EACH STATE BEING THE ONLY 'NATION;' whereas "it appears to the writer that with clear conceptions, that each "State is the real nation, the United States may properly be "called a 'nation' of nations. Mr. Dawson's edition of the "*Federalist* has been alluded to, and *his valuable notes will be* "*found coincident with the views herein taken*, and will be fol-"lowed with (*sic*) the publication of other debates connected "with the adoption of our Constitution, most opportune, and "furnishing important information of which few have knowl-"edge. * * *

"His extensive historical explorations convinced him, years "ago, that we were all wrong about the *theory* of our Govern-"ment."

A note, with a statement about his views on slavery, in which

it says, "Mr. Dawson very properly desires to have it *added*," &c.," intimates that the statements contained in the text, had been approved by him with that *addition;* and with the new light thus thrown upon Mr. Dawson's theoretic views, the facility with which he bends to them the most stubborn facts of history, and the plan of action in which he is co-operating, we recur once more to his Introduction to the *Federalist:* prepared to understand aright the part assumed by him in the scheme for denationalizing the American people by preparing their minds to discard the American Constitution, and to demand a convention of delegates from the States to inaugurate again a simple confederacy or league, from which each State, in the exercise of its separate sovereignty, may secede at pleasure.

It is to be noted that the authors of "Citizenship Sovereignty" profess to be entirely confident of success, although after "a tremendous conflict." How widely ramified is their organization is unknown, but they say (page 4 of "Explanatory"): "The views taken by Mr. Dawson as to the nature of our existing Government, and which are herein also presented, are "surely to be adopted by ninety-nine hundredths in the North," and they speak as though it were a certain thing, of "the changes that must be made in the new Union."

Among the first steps which ingenious plotters for the overthrow of our Constitution by effecting a revolution in public sentiment in favor of the confederate form of Government, which was discarded in 1789, would be:

First, to undermine the confidence of the people in the statesmen who exposed the defects of the confederation, and recommended the Constitution.

Secondly, To induce the belief that the evils under which the country then laboured, and which led to the relinquishment of the articles of confederation, and the adoption of the present Government, did not naturally result from any defects of the confederacy, but from extrinsic causes, and,

Thirdly, To show that the people had been induced to accede to the new Constitution on false pretences and by political trickery.

The publication of the *Federalist* with an Historical Introduction, has afforded an opportunity which has not been neglected, for endeavoring to indoctrinate the American public upon these three points, with the assumed impartiality of an editor, and the determined recklessness of a partizan.

The first point—the attempt to impair the confidence of the people in the heroes and statesmen who laid the foundation of our country's greatness—was one that no native-born American could be expected to undertake. Amid all the divisions and rancour of American parties, there is one ground on which our countrymen are accustomed to meet in harmony, one sentiment that they hold in common. From infancy they are taught to rejoice in their priceless heritage as citizens of one Republic, and on each recurrence of our national birthday they meet to celebrate in unison, the brave deeds and virtues of their fathers, and teach their children to do reverent homage to the great dead of our Revolution.

Not even a foreigner who in the least appreciated the historic grandeur that belongs to the infancy of our Republic, the heroism that in the cause of Constitutional freedom defied, in the field, the armies of Britain; and the statesmanship which commanded the highest eulogium from the lips of Chatham, could descend to the low office of violating the truth of History, in order to revile, and cover with odium their cherished fame. Easy as it is to pervert facts and misrepresent opinions, to rake over the newspapers and correspondence of the Revolution, and hunt up and dig out the exploded slanders of the last century, which have been buried so deep that their unpleasant effluvium has hardly polluted our atmosphere for generations; easy as it is to disinter these decayed libels, and to attempt to re-animate them with the breath of modern secession, and present them to the world as veritable facts of history, it is a task from which any man whose ancestors had fought in that struggle on the side of liberty, or who had himself drawn his first breath in the American Republic, would inevitably have shrunk.

This was the task which, in the scheme disclosed by the "Explanatory" of the Chicago volume for demoralizing the American people in regard to their national Constitution, with a view to aiding the Rebellion, was assigned to or voluntarily as-

sumed by Mr. Henry B. Dawson. His fitness for the work had already been proven beyond a question by the reckless audacity of his foul attack upon the fair fame of General Israel Putnam.

HIS UNPROVEN CHARGES AGAINST PUTNAM.

With none of those advantages of education which the country that he assisted to create has since bestowed upon his calumniator, with few of the accomplishments or characteristics which are usually associated with military greatness, and in despite of the temporary prejudices aroused against him by mishaps for which it afterwards appeared he was not responsible, General Putnam is yet one of the most popular among the heroes of the Revolution. By the force of his own talents and energy he raised himself from the position of a farmer to the station of the first Major-General in the army of the United States, standing in rank, according to his biographer, second only to Washington himself. Brave, humane, and devoted to the cause of his country, these manly virtues were combined with an illiterateness that seemed to identify him with the masses, and his fearlessness and patriotism have been handed down as household words: while the stories of his entering the wolf's den as a boy, and of his dashing down the heights of Horseneck where the British cavalry feared to follow, are cherished legends with the American schoolboy; and to-day the farmers of New York designate the county that bears his name by the title that was familiarly and affectionately given him of "Old Put."

In a small quarto volume, entitled "Gleanings from the Harvest Field of American History, Part VI., by Henry B. Dawson," printed at Morrisania, N. Y., for private circulation, in 1860, occurs, in a note on page 165, the following passage, intended, by a stroke of the pen, to brand Putnam as a traitor, and thus to convert the gratitude and admiration of the American people into execration and abhorrence:

"The evidence is before me which clearly proves the compli-
" city of General Putnam with Arnold in the West Point treason,
" for which Major Andre was hung and General Arnold became
" an exile and an outlaw."

Not a scintilla of the alleged evidence is produced nor even referred to, unless it be a New York letter in a London newspaper of December 21st, 1776, which says Putnam "never was a favorer of American independence," and which is entitled to about the same consideration as the letters in our time of "Manhattan" in the London *Standard*, or those of Charles Mackay, LL.D., in the London *Times*, or any other of the romances written to order by the British advocates of secession.

Washington, who had, during the war, disapproved, in part of Putnam's conduct, at the close of the war in 1783 wrote to him in these words:

"I can assure you that among the many worthy and meritorious officers with whom I have had the happiness to be connected in service through the course of this war, and from whose cheerful assistance and advice I have received much support and confidence in the various and trying vicissitudes of a complicated contest, the name of PUTNAM is not forgotten, nor will it be but with that stroke of time which shall obliterate from my mind the remembrance of all the toils and fatigues through which we have struggled for the preservation and establishment of the rights, liberties, and independence of our country."

During the Presidential tour in 1789, General Washington, mindful of his old companion in arms, and of the attachment felt for him by the country, and especially by New England, selected his route through Connecticut, with the intent of honoring him with a visit, and Dr. Dwight, who knew Putnam well, has recorded of him that his "uprightness commanded absolute confidence."

And it is the fame of a Revolutionary General thus trusted by Washington, thus endorsed by his intimate friends, and thus cherished by the American people, that Mr. Dawson has proposed to blot with treason and infamy, upon the unsupported word of a hostile Englishman, and the damnable insinuation of a foot-note.

It must be admitted that Mr. Dawson, the champion of the London *Times*, in its attacks upon our nationality, and now at

once the editor of the *Federalist*, and the abettor of those who are striving to destroy the constitution and give us in its place a compound of Southern secession and British aristocracy, has little reason to feel strong affection for the memory of the General who once sent so unpleasant an answer to Sir Henry Clinton, the representative of that "noble fellow, and splendid monarch, George III."

Lieutenant Palmer, an officer in His Majesty's service, had been arrested within our lines, and Sir Henry demanded his release. Putnam replied in language not to be mistaken, that Palmer "was taken as a spy, lurking in our lines, he has been tried as a spy, condemned as a spy, and shall be executed as a spy," and, an afternoon postcript to the note, curtly added, "he is hanged."

But even admitting that Mr. Dawson may be excused for not entertaining a warm sympathy for an officer who dealt thus summarily with *an English spy who falsely assumed to be a loyal American*, it must still be admitted that his effort to overthrow the fame of Putnam by his naked *ipse dixit*, is as fine an exhibition of British assurance, although not nearly so amusing, as any that Bourcicault has pictured for the stage, or that the American people have yet been favoured with in real life.

Where sleeps the ample proof, alleged by Mr. Dawson to be in his possession, that Putnam was the accomplice of Arnold? Why is it not demanded by the Historical Societies of Massachusetts, Connecticut, or Vermont, or do our Historical Societies think that they have nothing to do with the memories of American Statesmen, beyond furnishing facilities for the foreign calumniator to distort their history and blacken their fame?

There is no true patriot of the Revolution who may not be condemned as guilty of untold vices, if party libels and newspaper scurrility are received as proof. Washington was denounced in and out of Congress as "destitute of all merit as a soldier, or a statesman," and accused persistently of robbing the treasury—while Jay was damned as a traitor who had sold his country, and Hamilton as a monarchist who was resolved to overthrow the Constitution and introduce a king.

In addition to the lies circulated through the press, no small amount of scurrillity was perpetrated in more ephemeral ways;

and I was told the other day, at Boston, by the venerable James Savage, President of the Massachusetts Historical Society, of one rather remarkable anathema, which will be an invaluable addition to the stock which Mr. Dawson, according to his announcement, has accumulated with a view to proving Jay to be unworthy of the fame accorded to him.

It was during the height of the excitement aroused by the Democrats, who, under the lead of French Jacobins, raved against the Jay Treaty, that Mr. Savage saw these words chalked in large letters on the board fence around the enclosure of Mr. Treat Paine: "Damn John Jay! damn every one that wont damn John Jay!! damn every one that wont put light in his windows and sit up all night damning John Jay!!!"

If upon this curious reminiscence Mr. Dawson should base an assertion that Mr. Treat Paine had done the chalking with his own hand, that it embodied a solemn order of the City Council, and that all Boston sat up that night with lights in their windows damning Jay, and all who refused to damn him, the story of Mr. Savage would probably afford him fifty times stronger proof for his new version of it, than he can adduce for his most insolent declaration that General Putnam was a traitor.

By the same rule, some Dawson of the next century, may declare that he has the proof before him that Mr. Seward was "an habitual drunkard:" that Gen. Butler was a veritable "beast:" that Gen. McClellan had a secret interview with Gen. Lee the night after the battle of Antietam: and that Lincoln, sometimes supposed to be notably honest, truthful and patriotic, was in fact "a liar—a thief—a robber—a brigand—a pirate—a perjurer—a traitor—a coward—a hypocrite—a cheat—a trickster—a murderer—a tyrant—an unmitigated scoundrel, and an infernal fool." For this character of Mr. Lincoln, posterity may have the personal assurance of the editor of the Selinsgrove, Pa., *Times*, a democratic sheet that swears by Woodward, Vallandigham and McClellan.

Mr. Dawson has adopted, as the innocent motto of his audacious tract on Putnam, the verse from Ruth: "I pray you, let me glean and gather after the reapers among the sheaves." It may be impossible to fix a limit to the license of quotation, but

this is, I believe, the first time that the gentle appeal to Boaz has been cited as a warrant for playing the part of a scavenger of tory libels on American statesmen, or for robbing of their fame the silent dead of the battle-fields of the Revolution. Nearly four years have elapsed since that dastardly attack upon the patriotism and loyalty of the farmer-soldier of New England, and although Mr. Dawson declared that ample proofs of Putnam's treachery were before him when he penned the slander, he took excellent care not to produce them. He has never since submitted them to the world, and the country may well cherish its ancient confidence in the patriot-general, and rest undisturbed in their assurance that Putnam was loyal, and that the charge of his calumniator is false.

In view of his treatment of Putnam—which can hardly be characterized in language that a gentleman likes to use—the world will estimate aright the assurance given in Mr. Dawson's reply, that he can produce proofs of the infamous charges he has now brought against the great statesmen of our republic; for the reception of which, he has converted an introduction which pretends to be historic, into a cess-pool of libels on the authors of the *Federalist*—libels which, like insects in amber, the *Federalist* itself is insolently made use of to preserve.

HIS INJUSTICE TO CHANCELLOR LIVINGSTON.

Recurring to that introduction, let us glance at the portraits he has drawn of the leading friends of the Constitution in New York. One of the most earnest, eloquent, and efficient members of the State Convention, Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, who had been Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and had been thanked by Congress for his services in that high position, and who was subsequently our minister to France, appointed by Jefferson, is declared to have "evinced in public but little interest in the subject" of the Constitution; and the editor, with the same assurance with which he pronounced Putnam a traitor, accuses Livingston of an "overpowering love of ease," rendering him "dilatory and uncertain;" and with these unjust slurs upon his character and his course, this illustrious statesman is dismissed.

How wickedly truthless in its suggestions is this view of

Livingston's connection with the Constitution, will be seen by contrasting it with a sketch by Webster, in speaking to the citizens of New York:

" * * At the time of the adoption of the Constitution he was its firm and able advocate. He was a member of the State Convention, being one of that list of distinguished and able men who represented this city in that body; and he threw the whole weight of his talents and influence into the doubtful scale of the Constitution."

HIS WRONGFUL INSINUATIONS AGAINST DUANE.

Next is introduced the Honorable JAMES DUANE, an alumnus and trustee of Kings, now Columbia College, and eulogized by an eloquent writer as one of the few faithful among the faithless. As his career is not generally known, I will refer briefly to the leading incidents of his life. Mr. Duane represented New York in the first Continental Congress, heading the list of five deputies; and Duane and Jay are referred to by Lt. Gov. Colden, in his dispatch of the 6th July, 1774, to the Earl of Dartmouth, on these illegal proceedings, as "two eminent lawyers." Duane's course in that Congress was so satisfactory to his constituents that he was re-elected in April, 1775, to the Congress which met in Philadelphia on the 10th May. He was present on that day, assisted in raising an army, electing Washington commander-in-chief, establishing a post-office, and assuming other powers of government. He attended Congress faithfully until 31st May, 1776, when New York claimed his attendance in the New York Convention, to assist in framing a State Constitution, which he subsequently reported, acting meanwhile as an active member of a special committee on the forts in the Highlands, and the Committee of Safety. In 1777, Duane was one of a committee to arrange the Articles of Confederation. In 1778, he was again a member of Congress, at the urgent request of the Governor and his fellow-citizens; and still again in 1779–80.

In 1781, some slanderous articles, published anonymously in the newspapers, were brought to the attention of the Legislature, and that body, on the 27th June, passed a joint resolution ex-

pressing their continued confidence in him, and requesting his return to Congress. At the same time, Generals McDougal, Schuyler and Scott, Colonel Floyd, Chancellor Livingston, Mr. Wisner, and Gov. Clinton, who had been his colleagues in Congress at different times, came forward in his full vindication.

At the close of the war, the Common Council of New York City petitioned the Governor to nominate Mr. Duane as Mayor; "as no one," they said, "is better qualified, so none will be more acceptable to us and our constituents at large than Mr. Duane. Few have sacrificed more or deserve better from their country."

As Mayor, in 1785, he welcomed to New York the old Congress, and in 1789 the first Congress under the Constitution, and Washington as President of the United States. In the Mayor's Court, and as State Senator, he performed valuable services to the State, and in 1788 he was nominated by Washington District Judge of the Southern District of New York.

This office he resigned in 1794, when he declined also the wardenship of Trinity Church, which he had held since 1784, having been a vestryman some years before the Revolution. Resolutions were passed by the vestry testifying their regard. He soon removed to Duanesburgh, where, in 1795, Bishop Provoost consecrated an Episcopal church built at Mr. Duane's expense; and in 1796 he died honored and beloved.

Mr. Dawson takes pains to blacken the memory of Judge Duane by charges and insinuations of sympathy and collusion with the Royal authorities, carefully avoiding, however, specification of time—a most convenient omission for the more plausible perpetration of this sort of slander—especially if the reader should fail to remember that in the commencement of our Revolutionary difficulties there was not the slightest desire for independence on the part of the colonies, but that they exhibited the loyalty to the Royal authorities, which after the Declaration of Independence, they transferred to the revolutionary government established by the people. Washington, Jay Duane, and many of those most instrumental in establishing the National independence of the United States, and constituting them a nation, previously held honourable places under the Crown or the colonial governments; and the charge of sympathy or collusion with the Royal authorities, against a

statesman like Duane, made without specification of time, place, or circumstances, while it may seem to one forgetful of these facts to have a narrow basis of truth, is in its implication against his patriotism infamously false.

Botta, in his interesting history of the Revolution, fell into the mistake far more excusable on the part of an Italian, writing so long ago, than it can ever be on the part of later historians, of supposing that "there existed in the Colonies a desire for independence."

In a letter (13 January, 1821,) to Geo. A. Otis, of Boston, Jay, in regard to this passage, refers to the explicit professions and assurances of allegiance and loyalty to the Sovereign, especially since the accession of William III., which abound in the journals of Colonial Legislatures, and the Congress and Conventions, from an early period to the second petition of Congress, in 1775; and remarks, that if they were factitious and deceptive, they present to the world an unprecedented instance of long continued, concurrent, and detestable duplicity in the Colonies. He adds, "our country does not deserve this odious and disgusting imputation. During the whole course of my life and until after the second petition of Congress, in 1775, I never did hear any American of any class or description express a wish for the independence of the Colonies."

Dr. Franklin, in language if possible more comprehensive, assured Lord Chatham in August, 1774, that he "never had heard in conversation from any man, drunk or sober, the least expression of a wish for a separation, or a hint that such a thing would be advantageous to America." The letter of Jay to Mr. Otis was submitted by the latter to John Adams and Jefferson, both of whom thoroughly confirmed its statements. Jefferson declared, and his personal and political sentiments add force to his testimony, that before the commencement of hostilities, "I never heard a whisper of a disposition to separate from Great Britain, and after that, its probability was contemplated with affliction by all."

Mr. Gibbs, in the just and philosophic comments with which he introduces his "Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and Adams," after quoting Burke's remark of the American war, that it was not a Revolution, but a Revolution prevented,

says, "the course of events made it indeed a war of Independence, but there was in its tone nothing revolutionary, nothing subversive of the established order of things. Some leaders, more far-seeing than the rest, had predicted the result, but what the people wanted—what they took up arms to get, was not some new privilege—some new liberty, but the security of rights, privileges, and immunities which they had always had."

On the 6th of July, 1775, Congress published a declaration "setting forth the cause and necessity of their taking up arms," and in this they proclaimed, "we mean not to dissolve that union which has so long and so happily subsisted between us, and which we sincerely wish to see restored."

On the 8th of July, 1775, two days later, Congress individually signed a petition to the King. This "rather singular measure," in the language of the New York Review, "originated in the sagacity and prudence of Jay, who argued, and wisely, that in order to unite the nation in forcible resistance to Britain, it must be satisfied that all possible peaceful remedies were exhausted by the action of Congress. The result evinced his wisdom. Its rejection by the throne was the throwing away of the scabbard."

The petition, according to Mr. Curtis, in his "History of the Constitution," was refused a hearing in Parliament as emanating from an unlawful assemblage in arms against the Sovereign, and the country was thus prepared to accept with an unanimity that would otherwise have been impossible, the decisive action of Congress which culminated in the Declaration of Independence. While touching upon the subject of this petition, and Jay's part in it, I may refer incidentallyto the testimony of Mr. Bancroft, who, in his seventh volume, had unwittingly done injustice to Jay, by erroneously attributing to him traits which Jay in a familiar letter to an intimate friend written before the Revolution, and before his own character had been developed, had with characteristic modesty attributed to himself. In his eighth volume Mr. Bancroft, while gradually unfolding Jay's career in its close connection with the history of the country, recognizes "the firmness and purity of his character," and the profound wisdom of his counsels in securing unanimity in the adoption of a National policy and the recognition of the sovereignty of the people.

"The darker the hour, the more he stood ready to cheer—the "greater the danger, the more promptly he stepped forward to "guide. He had insisted on the doubtful measure of a second "petition to the King, with no latent weakness of purpose or "cowardice of heart. * * * Joining a scrupulous "obedience to his ideas of right with inflexibility of purpose, "he could not admit that the Provisional Congress then in "session had been vested with power to dissolve the connection "with Great Britain, and he therefore held it necessary, first, "to consult the people themselves. For this end, on the 11th "of June, the New York Congress, on his motion, called upon "the freeholders and electors of the Colony to confer on the "deputies they were about to choose full power of administer- "ing Government, framing a Constitution and deciding the "question of Independence—in this manner the unanimity of "New York was ensured."

Mr. Dawson completes his calumnies on Duane by denouncing him as "an unworthy member of Congress," &c., &c., and the fair fame of this gentleman, so closely identified with the city of New York as the first choice of her citizens for the mayoralty, honoured by Washington, cherished by Columbia College and Trinity Church, and remembered with pride and affection by the people of the State, is without the slightest occasion dragged before the public, to be branded with infamy and dismissed with scorn.

Then come the two statesmen of New York chiefly identified with the *Federalist*, and the triumph of the Constitution, to whom a classic orator of Columbia College has thus referred:

"Before our Revolutionary struggle, while itself, scarce "fledged, our college took an eagle's flight and gave to the "nation and its coming contest, I might almost say, its sword "and shield, the Marcellus and Fabius of our Rome, Hamilton "and Jay. What, I pray you, were the story of our Revolu- "tion without these names."

HIS MALICIOUS BLUNDERING IN REGARD TO JAY.

I have already exposed the untruthfulness of the charges against Jay, which are made with such blundering ignorance, as

almost to refute themselves, as for instance, when Mr. Dawson declares, that during the contest for the Constitution in New York, Jay was not looked to by the people for counsel or for leadership, but was regarded "by a majority of his fellow-citizens as selfish, impracticable, and aristocratic," when the total New York city vote for members of the Convention was 2,833, of which Jay received 2,735, leaving to represent Mr. Dawson's majority, who did *not* look to Jay for counsel or leadership, the beggarly account of 98. While on this topic, I may adduce one item of historic information, which I have within a day or two received from Mr. Bancroft, and which comes just in time to place the stamp of error upon one of the reckless assertions of Mr. Dawson, who, after representing Jay as lukewarm in his sympathy for the Constitution, says that he was "*induced* to undertake," the portions of the *Federalist* written by him, "both of them being subjects which his posi-" tion enabled him to discuss with unusual ability, without " compromising in the least his general political sentiments, " and without obliging him to assent, even by implication, to " any portion of the proposed Constitution."

JAMES MADISON TO THOMAS JEFFERSON.

"New York, August 10, 1788.

" Colonel Carrington tells me that he has sent you the first " volume of the *Federalist*, and adds the second by this convey-" ance. I believe I never yet mentioned to you that publication. " It was undertaken last fall, by Jay, Hamilton and myself. " The proposal came from the two former. The execution was " thrown, by the sickness of Jay, mostly on the two others."

Mr. Dawson's additional charge, that "some portion of Jay's earlier political action was remembered," at this period to his disadvantage, and had impaired the regard and confidence of his fellow citizens, is also disposed of by that most significent vote, and, indeed, by the concurrent testimony of American historians. On the 16th of May, 1774, he was appointed one of the New York Committee of Fifty, to consult on the measures

proper to be pursued, in consequence of the passage of the Boston port bill: next, one of a sub-committee, which, on the 23d of May, reported a letter to Boston, of which copies were sent to Connecticut, Philadelphia, and South Carolina, proposing a Congress of Deputies from the Colonies in general. On the 25th of July, he was elected unanimously to the Congress at Philadelphia, and there drafted the address to the people of Great Britain, which Jefferson pronounced the production of the finest pen in America—and which Dr. Sam. Johnson answered in his "Taxation No Tyranny." "That address," said the North American Review, "gave to Jay, at once, an ascendency which he never afterwards lost." In 1778, elected President of Congress, and the next year appointed Minister to Spain, then a Commissioner to negociate the Treaty of Peace, and after its conclusion, elected Secretary for Foreign Affairs, while yet abroad, and holding that place, the most important in the Confederacy, until it was superseded by the Constitution, when Washington offered to him the choice of places, and he selected the Supreme Court; it is difficult to conceive of a more truthless charge than that which, without the slightest regard to facts, has been so blunderingly brought by Mr. Dawson. "The first thing that strikes us in it," said Dr. McVickar, in the New York *Review*, October, 1841, after a after a rapid sketch of Jay's life, "is the unbroken continuity—
"the ceaseless succession of honorable confidences throughout
"this twenty-eight years' course, reposed in Jay by his country-
"men. From first to last not one intervening hour, the new
"office or new honor always claiming him before the old was
"ready to yield him, and oftentimes two or even three incom-
"patible calls of his country, contending for his choice; as, for
"instance, in the year 1795, Special Minister to England, Chief
"Justice of the Supreme Court, and Governor elect of the State
"of New York, all at one and the same moment. This, cer-
"tainly, is a singular fact in the history of any country; but,
"above all, in one especially jealous of such monopoly. What
"again adds to their wonder, in the popular judgment, though in
"ours it helps to explain it, is the total absence in Jay's char-
"acter, of all personal ambition. If honours came, they came
"unsought, and as often rejected as accepted, and we have his
"own direct authority, for asserting that through his whole life

" he had never asked an office, nor solicited a vote; and yet, as " we have seen, honour and office flowed in upon him in a " stream."

The American people are too well instructed in their own history to be at all disturbed in their estimate of Jay by the unsupported assertions of a foreigner. Of the insinuations against his patriotism and purity, so audaciously and insolently put forth in Mr. Dawson's letter, where each charge is, if possible, more infamous in its intent than the preceding, I shall take no notice. Webster's remark that " when the spotless ermine of the judicial robe fell on John Jay it touched nothing less spotless than itself," stands unquestioned by any American author, of any school of politics; and when it is known that Jay's new assailant is an Englishman, who denies our nationality, and would destroy our Constitution, his libellous critiques on its framers and supporters, after the first flush of indignation at this new instance of British audacity, will arouse no sentiment but contempt, with perhaps a slight feeling of annoyance, whenever he may chance to endorse a fact, or to commend a statesman.

HIS IMPEACHMENT OF HAMILTON, AND HIS FALSIFICATION OF HISTORIC TRUTH.

Of Hamilton, Mr. Dawson, in his introduction, professes to speak with admiration and respect; but his very compliments are indictments. On page 19, he intimates that Hamilton, as a matter of expediency, resolved to employ the press " for the dissemination of *sentiments*, which he hoped would counteract the *arguments* of his opponents;" and then an elaborate scheme which Mr. Dawson pretends to unfold for the deceiving and deluding the people of New York into the adoption of the Constitution, he attributes to what he calls " the tact which formed so prominent a trait in Hamilton's character." But it is quite clear, that if Mr. Dawson's statements are correct, Gen. Hamilton exhibited, not " tact " in its acceptable sense, but downright knavery, and that Mr. Dawson, while eulogizing his tact, is in fact, impeaching his integrity and his honour.

Of the Union formed by the present Constitution, Webster said: " It had its origin in the necessities of disordered finance, prostrate commerce, and ruined credit," and in the language of Curtis, in his able work on the Constitution, speaking of our condition

under the confederacy, the Union was "feeble, and trembling on the verge of dissolution," and the Government, utterly inadequate to the exigencies of a great empire, without funds and without credit, was unequal to the task of preserving the property and honor, or vindicating the rights of the nation. Disunion and ruin stared the country in the face, and its far-seeing statesmen viewed the probable consequences, in case the Constitution should fail to be adopted, with profound anxiety.

Mr. Dawson, after praising the acuteness and ability of the States' Rights leaders, in opposing the Constitution, and eulogizing their "powerfully written essays" against it, and, on the other hand, describing the *Federalist* as wanting in precision in the use of technical terms, and disfigured by the misfortune of its authors being hampered by their training under British masters, and their imperfect knowledge of the ancient Republics, and intimating that it was intended to disseminate *sentiments* in reply to *arguments*, ventures, with singular audacity, to confront the great facts of history, to deny the reality of the evils from which the country was suffering: to deny that the derangement of the Federal finances was the legitimate result of a radical defect in the articles of confederation: to charge that "the stagnation of trade," which he represents as "apparent" and not real, was "the necessary consequence of an over supply of goods and of an undue proportion of vendors when compared with the aggregate of the population;" and to aver that Hamilton, with the view of assisting "both to his projected condemnation of the existing Federal system, and to his proposed appeal in behalf of the new Constitution," resolved that the existing evils—that is, the derangement of the Federal finances, and the apparent stagnation of trade, should be "magnified to such an extent, and presented in such a manner, as to make them *appear* as the necessary results of a defective form of Government." (P. xx.)

We will stop for a moment, to examine this all important historical question of the condition of the country when the Constitution was adopted, in regard to which Mr. Dawson takes issue with the statesmen of the Revolution, and I believe with every American historian, for it is upon this, that he bases the charge of perfidy and deception against the friends of the Constitution, and against Hamilton as their leader.

In Mr. Dawson's letter to Mr. Motley, according to his friend, Mr. Wright, who anticipated from its publication such important advantage to the cause of secession and rebellion, and who bespeaks for it his readers' earnest attention, he—Mr. Dawson—"demonstrates *our immense prosperity* at that time," and "beyond doubt," says Mr. Wright, who evidently trusts to Mr. Dawson as to an oracle of truth, "beyond doubt it could have been said of us, as Moses sang of the Hebrews,—But Jeshuran waxed fat and kicked; thou art waxen fat that has grown thick, thou art covered *with fatness.*"

In his introduction, Mr. Dawson, with milder phrase, but with equal significance, charges that the apparent stagnation of trade was not owing to any defect in the government of the Confederacy; and makes these two assumptions, first, that our national prosperity at that time was so immense, and the land so covered with fatness, that overcome by an excess of prosperity, we kicked liked Jeshuran; and secondly, that whatever appearance there might have been of stagnation of trade—there being no such stagnation in reality, was owing to temporary and local causes. Upon these two assumptions rests his charge, made with some degree of circumvolution, it is true, but still distinctly made and implied, that Hamilton deliberately misrepresented and *magnified* the derangement of the Federal finances, and the apparent stagnation of trade, so as to make them *appear* as the legitimate result of a defect of the Articles of Confederation; and the conclusion naturally follows that Hamilton and his associates were a set of rogues, that their opponents were the only true patriots, and that the American people, by the most scandalous deception, were swindled into the ratification of the Constitution.

It would be impossible to open the volume of American history, in the years 1786, '7, and '8, without finding the saddest proofs, multiplying and accumulating, until the most sanguine of the revolutionary statesmen were almost in despair, of evils, calamities, and disorders, and above all of the loss of public faith and rectitude, that were fast humbling in the dust the American people, at the very time when Mr. Dawson would like his readers to believe that they were exulting in the immensity of their prosperity—and in fact kicking from a superfluity of fatness.

It would be hardly the thing to quote in opposition to his grave assertions, the explicit testimony of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, or any other of the men of the Revolution, of whom, by gentle insinuations, that they were "uncertain" patriots, "unworthy" members, and not entitled to the confidence of the people, he attempts to convey an idea not far removed from that expressed by Mr. Benton, when he said to the constituents of Mr. Petit—"Your Senator is a great liar and a dirty dog:" but as thus far Washington has escaped denunciation at the hands of Mr. Dawson, we will quote one or two from the multitude of similar testimonies contained in the private correspondence of the Father of his country, and they will show at the same time, the reasons he had for regarding State sovereignty as a "monster."

To Knox he wrote, 26 December, 1786—"I feel, my dear General, infinitely more than I can express to you, for the disorder which has arisen in these States. Good God! who besides a Tory could have forseen, or a Briton predicted them?"

After reading the account given by Washington, in the next extracts, of the extent of these disorders, the reader will be tempted to ask "who but a Tory could misrepresent, or a Briton deny them?"

To Madison he wrote:

"How melancholy is the reflection, that in so short a time we should have made such large strides towards fulfilling the prediction of our trans-Atlantic foes,—leave them to themselves, and their government will dissolve. * * Thirteen sovereignties pulling against each other, and all tugging at the Federal head, will soon bring ruin on the whole."

To Knox, 25th February, 1787, he wrote:

"Our affairs generally seem to be approaching some awful crisis. God only knows what the result will be."

To Lafayette, 15th August, 1787:

"The present Government has been found too feeble and inadequate to give that security which our liberties and property

render absolutely essential, and which the fulfilment of public faith loudly requires.

"Vain is it to look for respect from abroad, or tranquility at home; vain is it to murmur at the detention of our Western posts, or complain of the destruction of our commerce; vain are all the attempts to remedy the evils complained of by Mr. Demas, to charge the interest due on foreign loans, or satisfy the claims of foreign officers, the neglect of which is a high impeachment of our national character, and is hurtful to the feelings of every well wisher to his country, in and out of it; vain is it to talk of chastising the Algerines, or doing ourselves justice in any other respect, till the wisdom and force of union can be more concentrated and better applied."

We can understand, after reading this letter, the significance of the language used by the Convention which framed the Constitution, in submitting their work to Congress: "In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, *the consolidation of our Union.*"

Remembering that Mr. Dawson, according to Mr. Wright, has discovered that we are "all wrong about the *theory* of our Government," and "that he considers the word 'nation' should never be used in connection with the United States, each State being the only nation;" it is perhaps natural enough that he should wish, if possible, to discover new facts to support, in some degree, his theory. And as the Dawson theory is opposed to that of Jay, Marshall, Story, Webster, Curtis and Kent, it is not extraordinary that the Dawson facts adduced to support it, should be plumply contradicted by the emphatic testimony of Washington.

We return now to Mr. Dawson's introductory sketch and his further notice of the plan of operations concocted by Hamilton, for persuading the people that the Articles of Organization were defective. This "plan of operations," including, as we have seen, according to Mr. Dawson, the perpetration of a fraud on the people by unduly magnifying the apparent public evils, and falsely presenting them as due to one cause, when they were really due to another, if indeed they existed at all, he describes)

as "well calculated to produce confusion in the ranks of those "who opposed the new system, and to shake the confidence "of its leaders," meaning the anti-constitutionalists; and it "needed," adds Mr. Dawson, "only a careful elaboration of its "details, and a prompt and energetic execution of its different "parts to insure some degree of success. To secure these, "Colonel HAMILTON appears to have sought the assistance of "those whose peculiar qualifications adapted them to the dis- "charge of peculiar lines of duty, reserving to himself, however, "not only the general control of the discussion, but the execu- "tion of that portion of it which appears to have been attended "with the greatest difficulties."

Whether the parts of this "*plan of operations*," attended with the greatest difficulties, were those which required the largest skill and audacity in invention and misrepresentation, the greatest coolness in moral perjury, and the widest scoundrelism in deceit, is left to the imagination of the reader; but this, according to Mr. Dawson, was the damnable scheme to mystify a nation and deceive a people, into discarding a confederacy suited to their wants, and adopting a constitution inconsistent with their liberties, which Hamilton's "tact" enabled him to inaugurate, and which, as the head manager, he carried into execution, employing Jay and Madison as his subordinates and tools.

Well may the secessionists of Chicago claim Mr. Dawson as their honored ally, and point to his edition of the *Federalist* as an important instrument in preparing the people of America to subvert a constitution so fraudulently imposed upon them.

The temper and object of Mr. Dawson's Introduction may perhaps, in part, be gathered as much from what is omitted as from what is expressed. In the first place, there is no reference in the Introduction to the large influence exerted with the American people in favor of the Constitution, by the fact that it was reported to Congress by WASHINGTON, and by that great man warmly recommended for adoption; nor has Mr. Dawson ventured directly to attack the patriotism of the Father of his County. Such a course would instantly have excited alarm; but it is attempted to be shown that those whom Washington

loved and trusted were unworthy of confidence, and the views which they held in common with Washington, are misrepresented and decried. Even in his reply, Mr. Dawson ventures a sneer at the designation of States' Rights Sovereignty as a "monster," although he knew that the expression was from the pen of Washington.

Washington emphatically declared (Aug. 15, 1786), "Persuaded I am that the primary cause of all our disorders lies in the different State Governments and in the tenacity of that power which pervades the whole system."

The men of our day who would enlarge the sovereignty of the States, at the expense of that of the National Government, however much they may profess to reverence the wisdom of Washington, are setting at defiance his deepest conviction and most earnest counsels. In his Farewell Address, which he did not date at Philadelphia, nor at Mount Vernon, but which he significantly signed "George Washington, UNITED STATES, Sept. 17, 1796," he solemnly impressed upon the American people that "the unity of government is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence."

Again, Mr. Dawson, writing of the birth of that Constitution which has given to our country its proud place among the nations—of the more perfect consolidation of that Union which had existed since the Declaration of Independence, and of which the enlightened Emperor of Russia recently said: "The Union has exhibited to the world the spectacle of a prosperity without example in the annals of history," we find not one syllable from Mr. Dawson of eulogy or commendation; not one of the new vista of prosperity and happiness which it opened to the American people; of the long career of national progress which it secured for us, and which might have continued unbroken for centuries but for the assaults of that "monster," State sovereignty.

In Madison's *Debates* is preserved a pleasing reminiscence of Franklin, which might probably have found place in an introduction to the *Federalist* from the pen of one who believed us to be a nation.

On the last day of the session of the Convention, when the members were signing the engrossed Constitution, Dr. Franklin,

looking toward the President's chair, at the back of which a sun was painted, observed to the person next him, "I have often and often, in the course of the session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at the sun behind the President, without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising, and not a setting sun.

On the 20th of July, 1788, Washington wrote to Trumbull: "We may, with a kind of pious and grateful exultation, trace the finger of Providence through the deep and mysterious events which first induced the States to appoint a General Convention, and then led them, one after another, by such steps as were best calculated to effect the object, into an adoption of the system recommended by the Convention; thereby, in all human probability, laying a lasting foundation for tranquillity and happiness, when we had to much reason too fear that confusion and misery were coming rapidly upon us."

Mr. Dawson, presumptuously assuming, according to Mr. Wright, that we were "all wrong about the theory of our government," and that *he* is to correct the errors of our constitutional expounders, the well-known authoritative rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States, in regard to the character of our Constitution, are contemptuously ignored. The object of the framers, as Mr. Justice Story remarks, was to substitute a government of the people for a confederacy of States—a constitution for a compact. The Constitution, said Chief Justice Marshall, was ordained and established, not by the States in their sovereign capacities, but emphatically, as the preamble of the Constitution declares, by the people of the United States.

"The sovereignty of the nation," said the Supreme Court, by Jay, Chief Justice, in 1793, "is in the people of the nation, and the residuary sovereignty of the State in the people of the State."

The national government, according to Story, adopting the language of Webster, is as popular, and just as much emanating from the people as the State governments. It is created for one purpose, the State governments for another. It was made by the people, made for the people, and is responsible to the people.

If Mr. Dawson has been naturalized, and has become a citizen, not "of the State of New York," as he says, but of the United States of America, it is, of course, a pity that he can make no better return to the country which has so highly honored him, than by thus attempting to defame her statesmen, to misrepresent her history, and to overthrow her Constitution. One would suppose that the experience of the thirty years, during which he has shared the blessings which the Constitution has secured to the American people, might have taught him that the strongest feeling in the American breast is that of Nationality; and that he might have learned during the last three years, if he never learned it before, that when the question of nationality arises, true Americans of all parties are united; that loyal Democrats as well as Republicans hold alike to the resolve of Jackson, that the Union must and shall be preserved; that, whatever our differences on other topics, we are one in the determination that the sovereignty of the whole people of the United States, and the unity of our great Republic shall be maintained from the St. Johns to the Rio Grande, from the Lakes to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and that we will tolerate no interference with that sovereignty from any quarter, foreign or domestic, and certainly not from that exceedingly small class of Englishmen, who, admitted to the privileges of American citizenship, dare to sympathize with the rebels that would dishonor our flag, and who attempt to strengthen the arguments of our European opponents, by playing the part of Jackal to the British Lion, and second fiddle to the London *Times*.

Least of all are the loyal American people, at this moment, and in regard to this rebellion, in a humor to tolerate deception, or to acquiesce in fraud.

Had Mr. Dawson, in issuing his prospectus for an edition of the *Federalist*, announced with frankness that he had discovered that its authors were mistaken in their theory of government; had he in advance announced his belief, that the American people are not a nation, and declared that he advocated the separate sovereignty of the States, and the right of secession; had he simply adopted as the motto of his edition the language of his Chicago friend, and placed upon his title page

the words "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES! tear it in shreds! trample it in the dust!! damn it to everlasting infamy!!!" he might, at least, have escaped the imputation of soliciting subscriptions under false pretences. And if he had thereby admitted himself an ingrate to the country that had received him, and a traitor to the flag he had sworn to support, he might yet have commanded a certain sort of respect, as one who manfully avowed his real sentiments, and bravely accepted the responsibility. A Southern member of Congress, who was once referred to, on the floor of the house, as "an incarnate fiend," replied that, "if he was a devil, he was not a mean, sneaking devil;" but this boast, poor as it may have been, will hardly be indulged in by Mr. Dawson. Cleverly as the thing was managed, successful as he was for a time, in securing the countenance of descendants of the statesmen he was preparing to malign, and subscriptions and endorsements from loyal gentlemen; thanks to the blundering frankness of his secession friends of Chicago, illustrating the meaning of his introduction, the true character and aim of this edition of the "*Federalist*" *is found out*, and henceforth it takes its place in our literary history as a notable feature of the great rebellion.

It will, of course, be a subject of mortification to the gentlemen who have been deceived, and the exposure will be a warning to Historical Societies how they allow themselves to be used by "literary adventurers" (I borrow the expression from Mr. Dawson), for the manufacture of reputations in aid of treason. Little blame, however, can fairly attach to those who have supposed, until they had read carefully his introduction, that this editor of the *Federalist* was a supporter of American nationality. He came possessed, as he declared, of copies of the family papers of Jay and Hamilton, and they were approached in as innocent a guise as that assumed by the pirates of Jeff. Davis when they shipped as passengers on board the *Chesapeake*. And this brings me to a point involving an interesting question of fact, upon which I have a word to offer in reply to Mr. Dawson.

QUESTION OF FACT ABOUT THE FAMILY PAPERS OF JAY.

Mr. Dawson says: "You say concerning the family papers of Jay, relative to the *Federalist*, 'I (you) gave you (me) none

such;' and on that slight foundation you assume that I have had no such 'family papers of Jay,' at any time past or present, *from any other person*, and by inuendo you accuse me of falsehood and deceit. If it will gratify you, I will admit, as I do admit, that I have not received *from you* at any time any paper whatever 'relative to the *Federalist' per se*, except the original drafts of number LXIII. (these were discovered in a bundle of ancient newspapers after the volume was printed); but you must admit that I never said, even in the 'Prospectus,' which you have quoted from, that you had given any such papers to me at any time; and you must also admit, if you are not a willing slanderer, that the only foundation for your insinuation has been your own disordered imagination. Indeed, I challenge you to produce a single specimen of 'Prospectus,' 'Advertisement,' or any other publication either by myself or my publisher, wherein it is stated either by me or for me, that you had given me such 'family papers of Jay,' as you have described, or any other."

In this paragraph Mr Dawson makes two points:

1. He attempts to vindicate the truth of his assurance to the public, that in the preparation of the *Federalist*, he had been favored with copies of the family papers relative thereto of Chief Justice Jay, by giving the public now to understand that, although he had received no such papers from me, he *had received them* at some time or other from some other person or persons.

2. He insists that my assumption, that he could have had no such papers, because I had given him none such, rests upon a "slight foundation"—that its only foundation was my "disordered imagination," and he challenges me to produce a line from himself or his publisher in support of my assumption, that he had indicated me as the source whence he received the papers.

In reply to this second point, I quote the entire paragraph from his prospectus, of which he twice quotes only the first section, ending with "Chief Justice Jay," each time carefully omitting the last paragraph, which does indicate the source of the favor. I mark the section quoted by him, No. 1, and the section omitted, No. 2.

(*No.* 1.) "In the preparation of this edition of the *Federalist*, the subscriber has been favored with copies of *the family*

papers relative thereto of General Hamilton and Chief Justice Jay; (*No.* 2) and has also the pleasure to announce, through the further courtesy of Hon. James H. Hamilton and John Jay, Esq., original portraits of Messrs. Hamilton and Jay, for the illustration of the work."

I understood "*the further courtesy*" of Mr. James A. Hamilton and myself in furnishing portraits, to imply that it was through our *previous* courtesy that Mr. Dawson had been furnished with copies of family papers. I submit that that is the plain meaning of the passage, that the construction of the sentence justifies no other interpretation, and that his own language in the prospectus refutes the idea he now wishes to impress upon the public that he never intimated that he had received such papers from me. I entirely disbelieve his present intimation that he has copies of the family papers of Jay relative to the *Federalist per se* which have been given to him by some person or persons other than myself, and there are one or two facts bearing on this point in reply to his charge that my suspicion that he has no such papers rests on a "slight foundation," and, indeed, solely on my "disordered imagination." The will of Chief Justice Jay contained this item:

"I give and bequeath all my manuscript books and papers, other than such as respect my own estate or the estate of others, to my two sons, Peter A. Jay and William Jay, jointly, *and not to be divided.* On the death of one of my sons, these manuscripts are to belong solely and absolutely to the survivor."

Mr. Peter A. Jay died first, and the papers which had remained at Bedford, in my father's possession, then belonged solely to him, and by his will, he gave them to me. They have been kept together and not divided. Thinking it barely possible that a few papers might have by chance remained in the hands of Mr. Peter A. Jay, and have been given to Mr. Dawson by his son, Mr. John C. Jay, of Rye, I enquired, and was informed by Mr. John C. Jay that he had no papers of Chief Justice Jay, and that he did not know Mr. Dawson.

I know, from a conversation with my father about the *Federalist*, that *he* knew of no papers of Jay relating to the work, and if such manuscripts or copies of manuscripts exist, furnished to Mr. Dawson, as he intimates, by some "other person," at

some "time past or present," I know not why I should not repeat "Produce the papers."

Nor am I disposed to acquiesce in the propriety of his not producing them on the plea that he has ceased to lay stress upon them in his advertisements, and that he finds them comparatively unimportant. His language on this point is, "As my facilities for acquiring information concerning the *Federalist* were increased from time to time, I became myself satisfied of the comparative unimportance of the family papers of Jay and Hamilton relative to the *Federalist per se*, and I discontinued my references to them as deserving of special notice."

Whether this subsequent discovery of the little value of the papers was the only reason for discontinuing his references to them, or whether that discontinuance was owing, in part at least, to Mr. James A. Hamilton's declaring that there were no such papers of his father as the prospectus announced, and insisting that the announcement should be suppressed, I shall not stop to inquire: but the passage I have quoted from Mr. Dawson's reply will not satisfy the public with the non-production of the papers, for the question now is, not of their "comparative unimportance," but of their actual existence.

Mr. Dawson has had the temerity to charge me with having a "disordered imagination," and with being guilty of slander because I intimated that he was mistaken in supposing that he had any copies of family papers of Jay relative to the *Federalist*. He assures the public that he has such papers—not received from me, as he distinctly intimated in his prospectus, but from *some other person*, and he intimates that he has examined them at least twice; once before he announced in the prospectus that he had been favoured with such papers, which he then regarded as important, and again, after his facilities for information had increased, when he decided that they were of comparative unimportance, and discontinued the reference to them in his prospectus.

These "copies of family papers"—he mentions them in the plural, so that there was more than one—have become matter of profound historic interest, apart from their bearing on Mr. Dawson's veracity. Who gave to Mr. Dawson these copies? who has the originals? and where did the person or persons get the

originals? Seventy-six years have elapsed since the *Federalist* was written, and here are family papers of Jay respecting the *Federalist*, *per se*, of which his family never heard, discovered just in time to be useful to Mr. Dawson in his prospectus, disclosed to him alone, not communicated by him to me, notwithstanding the courtesies I had extended to him might seem to have entitled me to so simple a requital, suddenly discovered by Mr. Dawson to be comparatively unimportant after the prospectus had accomplished its object, and no longer announced either by him or his publisher, nor quoted in the text, nor as yet referred to in foot notes. So far as their historic value is concerned, according to Mr. Dawson, they spring up in a night, and wither in a day. But he still insists upon their reality; he represents them as tangible and visible, and he intimates that none but a disordered imagination could suppose that his statement was baseless as a dream.

Mr. Dawson, however, will see, or, at all events, those who read this correspondence will see, that nothing but the production of the alleged papers, and the disclosure of the person or persons from whom he professes to have received them, will satisfy his subscribers that he ever received copies of any family papers of Jay relative to the *Federalist*, from any person other than myself, and that as he admits he received no such papers from me, the assertion that he has such papers in his possession is entirely *erroneous.*

EXPOSURE OF MR. DAWSON BY HON. JAMES A. HAMILTON.

Mr. Dawson, in his reply to my first letter, in which, alluding to his claim that he possessed "copies of family papers relative to the '*Federalist*,'" I had said, "the sons of Hamilton knew of no such papers of their father," intimated that I was his sole accuser, and that "Mr. Hamilton, the respected second son of General Hamilton, had read that portion of the proof sheets of the advertisement to which I had alluded, *without suggesting any change whatever in the portion* to which I objected," and added, "he has subsequently been pleased to approve, in the kindest and most gratifying terms, *my entire volume as it has been given to the public, and my whole course as its editor, without the least exception*"

Here are two distinct averments voluntarily proffered by Mr. Dawson:

1. That Mr. James A. Hamilton suggested no change in that part of the advertisement to which I had alluded, and,

2. That Mr. Hamilton had approved of the entire volume, and of Mr. Dawson's whole course as its editor, *without the least exception.*

To these declarations, Mr. Hamilton has responded in the *Evening Post*, in a letter dated April 7, 1864, in which, in refutation of the first statement, he quotes a letter addressed by him to Mr. Dawson, on the 31st July, 1863, desiring him to strike his (Mr. Hamilton's) name from the advertisement, because he had given him no such advice or assistance as to authorize such a notice, and because he did not choose to be considered in any respect responsible for a work which he had not examined.

Mr. Hamilton quotes also a letter he had sent to Mr. Dawson on the 20th September, 1862, in which he said:

"Your prospectus is received. I regret to find in it this statement: 'In the preparation of this edition of the *Federalist*, the subscriber has been favored with copies of the family papers relative thereto of General Hamilton.' I have no knowledge of any family papers of General Hamilton, and did not favor you with any copies of such papers. My brothers and friends know such papers do not exist."

In answer to the charge that Mr. Hamilton had approved of Mr. Dawson's course as an editor, without the least exception, Mr. Hamilton quotes from the same letter, in which he declared he did not choose to be considered in any respect responsible for the work, which he had not examined.

* * * "I observe, with regret, that your introduction bears hardly upon Mr. DUANE, &c."

Mr. Hamilton remarks that he has since read that part of the introduction relating to his father's strategy, in which Hamilton

is represented "as a mere politician, deliberately uttering conscious sophistries and absolute untruths, for the purpose of cheating the people into a course of action that should serve his selfish ends, and, thereby, his party;" and, with natural indignation, that Mr. Dawson should have asserted that he approved of this with the rest of his volume, he exclaims:

"Surely, even the slightest respect for a father's memory would not permit such an assertion to pass unnoticed."

Mr. Hamilton, after alluding to Jay's wisdom, foresight, fairness, and patriotism, and to the confidence reposed in him by Washington and his contemporaries, declares: "It is impossible that I should have approved the groundless strictures upon his conduct and character." After a well deserved and scorching rebuke of that taste for calumny which "will go mousing about the scurrilous publications of our country during the period of our *ferocious party conflicts*," for atrocious libels on the wisest, purest, and most patriotic men of the time, he refers to the lies of one of Mr. Dawson's predecessors in this dirty work—"*An English hired calumniator*,"—one Callender, who, in a work published in 1800, sneered at the extravagant popularity possessed by "this citizen," *Washington*, and accused him of being twice a traitor and a robber of his army, with as much coolness as his successor and fellow-Briton, Mr. Dawson, now vents his ghoul-like spite upon the fame of Putnam, Livingston, Duane, Hamilton, and Jay. The thanks of the country are due to Mr. Hamilton, for his complete exposure of the various falsehoods whose utterance had compelled him to come before the public, in vindication alike of his own conduct and of his great father's memory, in spite of his advanced age, when controversy becomes a burthen, and of a recent domestic sorrow, in which a wide circle has deeply sympatized. His calm, clear, and convincing statement of facts, convicts Mr. Dawson of a degree of bad faith, which, but for the positiveness of the proof, would seem almost incredible, towards a venerable gentleman who had honored him with friendly attentions: and whose generous confidence he has basely betrayed, first by calumniating the father, and then by giving the country to under-

stand that these calumnies were approved of by the son. Mr. Dawson sought, in his advertisement, to convey a similar impression with regard to myself, and to make the world believe that I had furnished him with family papers that might be supposed to justify his mendacious charges against my grandfather.

DAWSON'S RENEWED CHARGES AGAINST JAY, AND THEIR REFUTATION.

In my first letter, unadvised of the object of his misrepresentations, I gently pointed out some of his more notable blunders, referring him, in several cases, to the positive proof of their untruth. Among others, I showed him that his averment that Jay's earlier conduct caused distrust and dissatisfaction; that he was not looked to by the people for counsel or leadership in regard to the Constitution, but was regarded by a majority of his fellow-citizens as selfish, aristocratic, and impracticable; was signally and thoroughly refuted by the vote of the city of New York electing him, at the very time referred to, to the State Convention, by a majority of twenty-eight to one; and by the fact that in that Convention, Jay was selected to move the adoption of the Constitution; and again, to draft the "Circular letter" to the States, recommending the adoption of the proposed amendments, which received the unanimous approval of the body, and secured the cordial acquiescence of the people of this State in the relinquishment of the Articles of Confederation, and the establishment of a National Constitution by the united voice of the whole people.

In his reply, Mr. Dawson, with a fatuity which would be surprising, had his behavior towards Mr. Hamilton left room for surprise at any degree of persistence in misstatements, again asserts that Jay was "*not* an advocate of the proposed Constitution."

In case this persistence should lead any one to suppose that there is a shadow of truth in the charge, I will quote a paragraph or two from Mr. Webster's elaborate letter to citizens of Westchester, to which I have already alluded, in which he dwelt at length on Jay's devotion to the Constitution, and quoted largely from his writings in its behalf:

"Gentlemen," said Mr. Webster, after an eloquent eulogium on Hamilton, "the mortal remains of another great man, venerated and loved through the whole course of a long life, repose in the county of Westchester; of course, I mean JOHN JAY. The public life of this illustrious man was almost wholly devoted to the preservation of the States, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION, and the administration of the powers conferred by it. No man saw more clearly, or felt more deeply, *the evils arising from the existence of States with entire and distinct sovereignties.* No man appealed to his countrymen against such a state of things with more earnestness, eloquence, or power. * * He foretold its dangers, and did as much as any man to secure the public opinion from its pernicious grasp."

Knowing, as we now do, that the aim of Mr. Dawsons' edition of the *Federalist* and the volume with notes that is to follow it, is to aid in the plot for resuscitating at the North the Rebel doctrine of State Sovereignty, that he denies that the United States constitute a nation, and insists that each State—South Carolina for instance—is a separate nation: and that his associates, who claim him as an earnest and effective ally in their traitorous scheme, are striving to trample the Constitution in the dust, and are prepared, if necessary, to join themselves "with the armies of the South," and inaugurate war upon Northern soil, against all loyal citizens; knowing Mr. Dawson's complicity with this infernal plot, it becomes clear that the fierceness of his assaults on Jay is induced not by the pretended fact that he was opposed to the Constitution, but by the historic fact, so clearly stated by Mr. Webster, that to no man was the country more indebted for the establishment of the Constitution, and that no man more early or more effectively opposed the assumed right of the States to override the sovereignty of the people. Whether as a legislator or as Chief Justice, Jay uniformly maintained the doctrine—then as now denied by the opponents of our nationality—that "the only true source of sovereignty is the People." The further fact stated by Mr. Webster, and confirmed by the testimony of the living and the dead, that Jay was "venerated and beloved through the whole course of a long life," seems to

have afforded to Mr. Dawson a provocation to attribute to him qualities that would forbid all idea of such veneration and affection, and impair at once the regard of youthful and unenlightened readers, for his character, his abilities, his influence, and his position.

The task is one which Mr. Dawson would have found difficult to accomplish, even if his own aims had not been discovered. As it is, the malignant hatred he exhibits towards Jay I accept as the most fitting homage which can be paid to his memory by an Englishman, who, declaring that his "grandfather was an honest English laborer," is seeking to destroy the Republic in whose preservation are involved the hopes of honest labourers of England and the world over;—of a foreigner, who sheltered by our flag and educated in our schools, repays the debt by attempting to subvert the American Constitution, joining himself with the London *Times* and aristocratic sympathizers with rebellion, to destroy the unity of our Republic, and blot our country from the roll of nations.

Long before the instinctive conviction of Washington and Jay in regard to the danger with which the doctrine of State Sovereignty threatened the American people, had been verified as it now is, by the most destestable rebellion recorded in history, and while loyal Democrats still looked with doubt and displeasure on the national doctrines held by the framers of the Constitution, which have since been approved by the supreme judiciary, and incorporated with our common law—one of the very warmest of Jay's political and personal foes, *James Monroe*, (according to his eulogizer, John Quincy Adams,) in the zenith of public honour, and in the retirement of his latter days, "left recorded with his own hand a warm and unqualified testimonial to the pure patriotism, the prominent ability, and the spotless integrity of John Jay." When such was the feeling towards Jay in the calm evening of life, on the part of one who had been his active, earnest, and prejudiced opponent,—and a similar testimonial is said to have been paid to him, after a long period of separation, by his early friend and subsequent rival, Chancellor Livingston:—we need not wonder at the bold language used by that accomplished scholar and elegant writer, Gulian C. Verplanck, in his often-quoted eulogy on Jay:

"A halo of veneration seemed to encircle him as one belonging to another world while yet lingering among us. When the tidings of his death came to us, they were received through the nation, not with sorrow or mourning, but with solemn awe, like that with which we read the mysterious passage of ancient Scripture—And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him."

OUR PRESENT POSITION, AND THE COMBINATIONS AGAINST US.

One advantage, and it is not a slight one, which we derive from the disclosures made by the frank volume of Mr. Wright, and his political literary coadjutors throughout the North, among whom Mr. Dawson is so prominent, is a more accurate knowledge of our position. We learn from their own pens the real sympathies and designs of these "Federal Republican" citizens, *alias* State-Rights Democrats, who, in their assaults upon American nationality, their distortion of American jurisprudence, their falsification of American history, and their shameless libels upon American statesmen, are found to be sympathizers with slavery and rebellion, the fast friends of British aristocracy, and the earnest allies of the London *Times*.

The same men who, under pretence of maintaining State Rights, consign to infamy the American Constitution, and threaten to unite with the rebels and devastate the loyal North, are the men who declare, "Let the nobility of England understand that they have in us earnest coadjutors to maintain aristocracy;" and they rightly feel that any step in this direction is hopeless, unless they can impair the feelings of American nationaliiy, by destroying the reverence of the people for the men who assisted at the birth of the nation, who proclaimed its fundamental principles in the Declaration of Independence—who rescued it from the dissolution threatened by the imbecility of the Confederation, and established its unity and strength by our national constitution.

The effect of that Constitution in consolidating the power of the American people was at the time duly appreciated by the sagacious statesmen of Europe, and when Genet came to us as minister from the "French Republic," he submitted to our

Government official documents disclosing the unfriendly views which had been entertained by Vergennes and Montmorin towards the United States, manifesting in plain terms the solicitude of France and Spain to exclude the United States from the Mississippi. Their jealousy of the growing power and ambition of this country, *and the wish of France expressed while the question was pending that the Constitution might not be adopted*, as it suited France that the United States should remain in their present state, because if they should acquire the consistency of which they were susceptible, they would soon acquire a force or a power which they would be very ready to abuse."

Notwithstanding the careful avoidance by the United States for seventy years of all meddling with the affairs of Europe, and the recognition, as an American principle, of the non-intervention recommended by Washington, we have found that aristocratic England is, from the real or supposed exigencies of its position, the inevitable foe of the American Republic, expressing frankly in view of our supposed dissolution, the fears it has entertained of our rising greatness. They saw in us, according to the London *Times*, "a great empire that had threatened to predominate over all mankind." And for a little while they exultingly believed that we were shattered into fragments. It is not to be supposed that they will view with satisfaction the re-establishment of our national unity, or that they will forget, in our case, the maxim which England so well understands, divide and conquer.

Immense disappointment has been created by the views and the conduct of the British aristocracy, British statesmen, and British authors: with such notable exceptions as the Duke of Argyle and Lord Carlisle, Richard Cobden and John Bright, Mill and Newman, and Forster, and others, whose names will be always remembered with honour as men who rose to the dignity of the occasion, and remembered their duty to humanity and to God. But, however great has been our disappointment at the low and narrow view of the American question taken by the higher classes in England, or however modified that disappointment has been by the wider instincts and broader sympathies of the working classes, in the efforts of the American people to maintain against the assaults of slavery, liberty na-

tionality and law, the fact remains that we have calmly accepted the situation; we recognize the inexorable fact that our fate is in our own hands; we have had a bitter foretaste of the treatment that awaits a divided people, and we realize the truth that there is no end to the insults, and no depth to the humiliation which we may expect, not alone from England, but from every nation in christendom, unless we re-establish the prestige of our Republic by maintaining the integrity of our borders, the supremacy of our Government, and the honour of our flag.

It is not the part of wisdom to undervalue the significance of concerted and hostile movements on account of the insignificance of the tools employed, nor in our contempt for the infamy of the workmen, overlook the dangers with which their masters threaten us. To one accustomed as we are, to contemplate with pride, the intelligence, the patriotism, and the common sense of the American people, it may at first seem unreasonable to suppose that a man who murders the queen's English, can do the least harm to the American Constitution, or that a book-worm burrowing amid the rubbish of the party by whom that Constitution was opposed in its infancy, can aid the faction that would subvert it in its strength, by resuscitating for the benefit of the Tories today, the libellous abortions that struggled and died in the last century.

But the fact is not to be forgotten that each is doing his own allotted part in a grand conspiracy against American nationality, " and that like grains of gunpowder" to borrow an image from Coleridge, " although each by itself be smutty and contemptible, their combined force may be terribly destructive."

In this conspiracy are arrayed against us not simply the rebels of the South, bent upon the establishment of a slave empire, headed by crafty and desperate leaders, guided by officers educated by ourselves, who have violated their honor and betrayed their flag, and backed by a misguided army of determined bravery; but the aristocracy of England, who having thrown away the friendship of this great nation, with a folly as great as that by which their ancestors estranged and lost their most loyal colonies, now see in the success of Republican governments the decay of their order and the prostration of their power. To

these must be added the despotism of France, presently to be represented on our continent by an Arch-Duke of Austria, whose very presence on the throne of Mexico, guarded by French bayonets against the reluctant people he comes to govern, will be of itself an insult to our own country that will rankle in the breast of every true American. Last of all to aid these foes of our Republic in the South, in Britain, in France, and in Mexico, appears an anti-constitutional party in the North, with Democracy and State Sovereignty for their battle-cry, equally bent with our aristocratic, our monarchial, and our imperial enemies upon the destruction of our nationality—a party, whose wealthy members in this metropolis, supply funds for circulating perversions of history and travesties of religion: whose ideas of patriotism and honour allow men assuming to be gentlemen to approach with supple knees a British minister, and solicit in our domestic affairs foreign intervention: who assure of their sympathy and support the British aristocracy, even while they are chuckling over the exploits of British iron-clads in sweeping from the seas American merchant-ships and transferring our commerce to British bottoms: who volunteer assistance to the "London *Times*," in its malignant assaults upon our national integrity, and distort facts to sustain its unsupported arguments: and who, when they forget their caution, raise their traitorous voice against the American Constitution, calling on the people to tear it into shreds, and consign it to eternal infamy. It is one of these conspirators who, under colour of impartial history, has falsified the truth, and under pretence of enlightening the world by reproducing the wise counsels of the *Federalist*, has raked the ashes of the Revolution for libels on its authors, and issued to an unsuspecting people the immortal volume of Hamilton Madison and Jay, prefaced by inventions infamously false upon the purity of their patriotism and the worthiness of their fame.

I am, Sirs,

Respectfully your obedient servant,

JOHN JAY.

119 Madison Avenue,
New York, April 14, 1864.

H 2004 084.09090